

help of the Federal Government, there could be no secure provision for the Games and no certainty that we could be protected.

The morning after the attacks of 9/11, I happened to be in Washington, and I called Senator Hatch on the phone. He at the time was in his Senate office. I asked if we could get together at some point to talk about how we could move forward and provide the security funding that might be necessary to protect our Games. Without hesitation, he said, "Come over to the office right now."

I did so. When we got there, we sat down, and he said, "What do you think you need?" And I described the need for fencing and personnel to evaluate the security threats that might exist, a military air capacity to secure the skies over Salt Lake City during the Games.

He said: Well, what is the biggest challenge you will face?

I said: Well, Senator John McCain of Arizona has not been a fan of providing support for Olympic Games. He thinks that money has been misused in the past.

He said: Well, it wouldn't be misused now, given what has happened with 9/11. Let's go see John McCain right now.

He picked up the phone and called Senator McCain. Senator McCain said he would be happy to see me and his friend Orrin Hatch. We went over to Senator McCain's office and sat down. Orrin Hatch proceeded to describe how important it was that we host the games and that Senator Hatch get the support that he needed. And, in fact, Senator McCain made it very clear he would not stand in the way of doing anything we needed to secure the games in Salt Lake City.

I owe Orrin Hatch a great deal of credit for helping us to be able to host games in Salt Lake City successfully and to do so without security incident.

I think everyone knows that Orrin Hatch was a man of tremendous faith. He was an advocate to protect religious freedom, and legislation that he authored in this regard still stands in protecting the rights of people of faith in our country today. He dedicated his life to a commitment to Jesus Christ and to the principles of Christianity. He did so in my own faith by accepting callings in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, serving as both a missionary as a young man and later as a bishop of a congregation.

Orrin Hatch enjoyed life and appreciated all that it had to offer. You may know that he was a composer and has a number of songs and musical performances to his credit. He wrote poetry. He wrote jokes. When I was running for President, he sent me a whole page of jokes he wanted me to use. I must admit, I looked at them one by one. I didn't think they were that funny, but I read them to the people on the bus and they listened to them one by one and the more they listened, the

funnier they got. By the time I was finished with the page, they were howling with laughter.

The man had an extraordinary capacity with music, with humor, with legislation, with friendships—really one of a kind.

He also was pretty good at self-deprecating jokes. He told me to lighten up a little bit and be a little more free with my language, so I decided to let "heck" and "dang" drop into my words from time to time.

His affinity for buffets and bacon were not to be forgotten as well. In his words, we should choose "to live every day like [it was] Bacon Lovers Day." And I hope we will savor life as he did.

Orrin Hatch believed that the people you love and the friends you have are the real currency in life. I believe that deeply. He had a lot of friends, not just in this room but friends throughout these buildings, friends throughout our State.

I remember walking through the Capitol with Orrin Hatch and from time to time someone would come up to him and want to ask him a question or ask for help on some issue of theirs. And instead of doing what most of us do—which is putting our head down and rushing on and pointing out that we have important things to get to—he would stop and bend his very tall physique down to listen to what the person had to say and listen attentively and say he would do what he could to help. I have seen that time and time again with Orrin Hatch.

He always had time for the people he served, and he believed he served all the people of the United States of America. Not surprisingly, he had and still has a lot of friends.

Of course, when you think of people he loves, first on that list would be his wife Elaine and their family. They together raised 6 children and 23 grandchildren, 26 great-grandchildren. He and Elaine were married for more than six decades. She has been by him every step of his career and his political involvement in our country.

Ann and I send our deepest condolences to Elaine and the entire Hatch family. God be with you until we meet again, Orrin. I hope you feel I haven't let you down taking your place in this great Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, about 6 years ago, I came to this floor and presented an idea: How do we get on top of our debt and deficit? Are we going to get on top of our debt and deficit?

Interestingly enough, for each of us and our own families, we can all tell a story about a season in our life that we really hit hard times. I have had several where the money was really tight and our family was very attentive to what we were spending—very—those moments when we would literally make sure that every time we went to

the grocery store, we only spent this much because we knew we had an electric bill coming in; we knew we had our rent coming due.

My family has most definitely been there. My wife and I, when we were first married, we had a rule that we couldn't ever spend more than \$25 without the other person knowing it because our fear was when we were first married that one of us would spend \$30 and the other would spend \$35 that day and we would blow up our bank account because we were living that close to the edge and just getting by while I was at school and we were just getting started. A lot of families have been that way.

You can tell how serious a family is about dealing with their debt by how seriously they take their expenses. There are some individuals that have massive debt that still keep running up their credit card. They keep buying more and more product. They still use their credit card and go get additional electronics and get extra stuff on it and max out this card and then I will max out another one, not with essentials, just with fun—not paying attention to the fact that someday that comes due.

When I started presenting the idea of the "Federal Fumbles," my whole concept was simple: Where is it the Federal Government is dropping the ball; that we are not paying attention to the areas we need to be able to pay attention to in our spending? It is a well-known fact that we have trillions in debt. In fact, as a nation, we have now crossed \$30 trillion in total debt—\$30 trillion. It is interesting that the conversation doesn't seem to be serious. We don't seem to be in a dialogue about how we are going to actually bring our debt down. We are still spending on other things and still saying, not we are limited in what we can do; we seem to be adding more to the mix. It is not necessarily on essential things; it just seems to be on things.

The "Federal Fumbles" book that I released this week, put on our website, just details several different items. One is, where are we in our debt and how did we get here? But I also try to walk through some of our trust funds on this because I think it is important.

Where are we on Medicare trust funds? By the way, we are 4 years away from insolvency on Medicare—4 years. Where are we on Social Security? We are 12 years away from insolvency in Social Security—12. Where are we on the highway trust fund? We are well past insolvency on the highway trust fund, and we have been accelerating our borrowing to try to cover more and more. In fact, that was done even recently.

I laid out a set of ideas of how do you actually solve some of these things and how are we going to address it. But I also laid out some of my frustrations that said, at some point, this body is going to be serious about dealing with debt and deficit, but apparently we are not yet.

So I laid out some areas and just got a chance to be to be able to talk through some of those in the book. And I encourage folks to be able to look at it and, quite frankly, everyone is welcome to disagree with me on it.

For instance, we spent \$2 billion—billion with a “b.” We spent \$2 billion this last year not building the border wall. The contracts had already been let out. The steel was already purchased. The steel, in fact, is lying on the ground in the desert still today. Everyone was already hired, and there were literally individuals on the ground ready to do installation because the contract was there because career professionals at the Department of Homeland Security had made recommendations on certain areas of our southern border that desperately needed fencing. Those career professionals had worked with private contractors and had put a contract in place to be able to put fencing in those areas. And they were underway until the Biden administration stepped in on day 1 and stopped it all, though the contracts had already been let out. We spent \$2 billion not building border fencing—\$2 billion.

Now, I ask the simple question: What would it hurt to go ahead and finish those contracts out that career professionals had signed off on and that career security individuals from the Department of Homeland Security had said was desperately needed in those areas? What would it have hurt to finish those contracts out? Instead, we sent messaging that we are not going to build a fence and spend \$2 billion not doing that.

What did we do instead? Well, we started doing robot dogs along the border instead. I wish I was kidding. These robot dogs would instead be hired to be able to help our border folks and Border Patrol and CBP to be able to help identify and carry things. So instead of border fencing, it is robot dogs that are now being contracted to be able to put in there.

What else did we actually deal with? Well, of the trillions of dollars of debt that we have, recently, we put \$2.6 million into China to help pay for some of their health programs. Now, follow the irony of this. We actually borrow a trillion dollars from China to pay our bills. So we borrowed money from China to be able to then send money to China to help pay their medical expenses.

Does anyone else think this is a bad idea; that if we were serious about dealing with debt and deficit, we would start going line by line through all of this and to be able to identify that maybe this is not a good idea; that if we have \$30 trillion in debt, maybe we need to find some areas to cut back on. We could cut back on that or maybe we could cut back on the grant that was given out to write about Russian screenwriters. We actually paid someone to do research on Russian screenwriters to be able to release this project out so people could study Russian directors and screenwriters.

Again, I am fine if anybody wants to be able to do that, but my concern is if we are going to do this, this should probably be a private project that we release out, not have a Federal Government project when we are dealing with \$30 trillion in debt.

But what else did we do with our additional money while we have extra spending and time on this? How about lobster pot removal? We spent half a million dollars in a special earmark to do lobster pot removal.

Now, initially, this is actually listed in the bill as derelict lobster pots. Derelict lobster pots. That sounds really ominous, doesn't it? But my understanding is it is lobster traps that are just out there that someone abandoned at some point.

I would tell you, for those of us in Oklahoma, if you told me there is a lobster trap and there may be a lobster in it and you could keep the trap and the lobster if you wanted to go get it, we would go get it. But, instead, we are paying half a million dollars in Federal dollars to go pick up derelict lobster pots.

Now, again, I would say to you, in Oklahoma, when we have a derelict well in Oklahoma, an oil and gas well, our oil and gas companies all pool money together and put a little bit in to be able to go clean that site up. And, year by year, we are cleaning up abandoned well sites, because our companies actually kicked the money in to go clean up their own messes that are out there.

I don't understand how the State didn't do this or a city didn't do this or the industry didn't take it on. Now, I do have some frustration because there was some money set aside for parks as well. I am a big fan of parks. My kids go to the park. We are glad to be able to go to the park. I went to the park a lot. But there was a project for 2.3 million in Federal money to be able to renovate a pool, a swimming pool, in Rhode Island.

Now, I am not opposed to swimming pools, and I am not opposed to Rhode Island having swimming pools; I am just trying to figure out with Federal dollars, why the Federal government is paying to fix a swimming pool in Rhode Island. Shouldn't this be the State of Rhode Island—if it is a State park, shouldn't it be the State or the community or the city to be able to take this on? Cities in my State, if they have problems with their pool, the city pays to be able to fix the pool or the community pays to be able to do that, rather than the Federal taxpayers pay to do that. We have the same issue, actually, with a ski jump, that there was a State park, that it needed a renovation for a ski jump, and so instead of the State actually paying for their State park, people in my State are paying for our State park, and we are paying to fix the ski jump in this State park as well.

Why are we paying for both? Why don't the people of Oklahoma pay for

our State parks and the people in other States pay for their State parks? Again, I have nothing in opposition to ski jumping, other than it seems like a particularly terrible thing for me to do, but if somebody wants to be able to do it and they want to pay for that, that is fine. Just, why should Oklahoma taxpayers do that?

As we were digging through the different pieces that were actually done, I would tell you it was painful the moment when we ran across the monkey opera. We spent Federal tax dollars on something called a “monkey opera.”

Now, I am not sure why we spent Federal tax dollars on a monkey opera. I am not sure what a monkey opera sounds like. But I would tell you, I think I have listened to a monkey opera on people's at-hold music before when I have called certain companies, that I think the hold music they have was actually monkey opera. But I have to ask the hard question: Is this national defense? Is this educating our children? Is this healthcare?

With \$30 trillion in debt, at some point, we as a Nation have to stop and say, “OK, let's do what is essential and not what's not.”

Two weeks ago, a staff member called me and said she was in line at the grocery store, and the woman in front of her with her kids pulled out all the stuff in her basket and put it on the scanner area and said to the lady that was going to be the cashier, “Hey, tell me when it gets to \$150 because I can't spend anymore. That is all I have.”

And so the cashier kept ringing things up. She held things back that she thought were the nonessentials at the end because she knew, this is all I have, and though I would like to get more, I can't. It sent me two messages. One is, every family knows how to do this. Why we can't as a Federal government look at it and say, with \$30 trillion, maybe the monkey opera is not one of our essentials, I don't know.

But the second thing it reminded me of is, every family is dealing with the real effects of inflation right now. It is very real for them. They are saying to the cashier at the grocery store, “Tell me when it gets to this dollar amount, because that is all I have.”

When we continue to spend more and more and more as a Federal government, it drives inflation higher and higher. I am very aware there are a lot of folks in this room who are just trying to help. But we are causing real problems with inflation, with overspending as a nation. That has got to pull back, and we have got to get serious about what we are spending on, because this kind of stuff drives the American people crazy, when they are saying to the cashier, “I could only do \$150. Please tell me when it gets there, because everything else I can't do today.” And we borrowed more money from China so we could do this.

We put out the Federal fumble book every year for one reason: I want to remind everybody in this body that debt

is still a problem. This is still an issue, wasteful spending, whether it is in the billions or whether it is in the thousands, is wasteful spending. And at the end of the day, we need to understand, the American people are counting on us to make hard decisions, and there are lots and lots of hard decisions. But currently as a body, we are not even discussing \$30 trillion in debt. So I bring it to us again: We have \$30 trillion in debt. Let's start working on this.

I yield the floor.

#### NOMINATION OF SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Judge Sherilyn Peace Garnett to serve as a U.S. district court judge for the Central District of California.

Judge Garnett is an experienced jurist and a long-time public servant who will make an outstanding addition to the bench. During her 13 years as an assistant U.S. Attorney, she prosecuted hundreds of matters, including criminal street gang offenses, child exploitation, and threats made against government officials. In recognition of her accomplishments as a prosecutor, Judge Garnett received a number of awards from the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of California, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the U.S. Postal Service.

Since 2014, Judge Garnett has served as a Los Angeles Superior Court judge, presiding over misdemeanor and felony proceedings. In 2016, she also served as an appellate State court judge, presiding over criminal, civil, and family law cases.

The American Bar Association has unanimously rated Judge Garnett as "well qualified" to be a district court judge. She also has the strong support of her home State Senators, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. PADILLA.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Judge Garnett's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion with respect to the Gordon nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

#### VOTE ON GARNETT NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Garnett nomination?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILIBRAND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Ex.]

#### YEAS—62

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	McConnell	Tillis
Cornyn	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Ernst	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Padilla	Wicker
Graham	Peters	Young
Grassley	Portman	

#### NAYS—33

Barrasso	Hagerty	Moran
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Blunt	Hoeven	Risch
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Lummis	Thune
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville

#### NOT VOTING—5

Cotton	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Toomey	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Washington.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES RELATING TO "ENSURING ACCESS TO EQUITABLE, AFFORDABLE, CLIENT-CENTERED, QUALITY FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES"—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, for too long, Americans' taxpayer dollars have been used as a backdoor way to help promote abortion as a family planning service. President Trump put a stop to this. Back in 2019, he barred the Federal Government from providing these funds, the funds through the title X Family Planning Program, from going to entities that refer or provide abortions, organizations such as the big business that is known as Planned Parenthood.

Now, understand, it didn't reduce title X funding. It didn't cut one penny of it. Instead, it directed it to organizations that do not perform and do not promote the taking of innocent life.

Last year, unfortunately, the Biden administration, as was to be expected, pulled the plug on this vital protection, and now we see taxpayer money flowing once again to these abortion providers and to their referrers. This has to stop, and that is why I have worked with Representative TONY GONZALES in the House to introduce the Congressional Review Act of title X to ensure that not one more taxpayer dollar is used to fund the abortion industry.

By reversing this administration's ruling, abortion clinics will once again be excluded from receiving this taxpayer money, and it would put more money toward improving and saving lives instead of ending them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to be really clear about what this vote is actually about. This vote is about birth control. This is about lifesaving pelvic and breast exams to detect cancer early, and it is about STI testing and treatments. That is the basic reproductive healthcare that title X providers deliver to communities—especially to women with the tightest budgets.

Republicans are here tonight fighting to undermine healthcare. It is really that simple. And we are here fighting to protect it.

I fought long and hard against President Trump's disastrous gag rule. It was a rule that cut title X provider networks in half. It forced entire States, including my home State of Washington, out of the Title X Program. It forced doctors and nurses to withhold information from their patients on all the options they have, including abortion, and ultimately resulted in patients traveling farther, paying more, or going without care. In short, it made it harder for women to